

Attorney Docket RSW920000077US1
Serial No. 09/754,891

Remarks

In the Office Action dated February 17, 2006, the Abstract was objected to as being too long. With this paper, the Abstract has been amended to reduce its length to less than 150 words.

Further in the Office Action, the specification was objected to because the status of a cited U.S. Patent Application on page 25 needed to be updated. With this paper, the specification has now been amended to update the status of that application.

Claims 1-30 stand rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by a document entitled "e" speak Tutorial, Version: Beta 2.2, December, 1999 (hereinafter the "prior art document").

Independent claim 1 recites, in part:

computer-readable program code configured for reading a specification of an e-business service; and
computer-readable program code configured for processing the specification to carry out the e-business service, further comprising:
computer-readable program code configured for receiving at least one input document for the e-business service; and
computer-readable program code configured for performing at least one of: transforming the input documents into other documents, according to transformation information that may be provided in the specification, and operating upon the input documents or the other documents to create one or more new documents, according to operating actions that may be provided in the specification.

Independent claims 8, 15 and 22 include similar recitations.

On page 5, the Office Action defines "specification" as comprising interfaces "ListenerIntf" and "DistributorIntf," which interfaces are set out at the top of page 36 of the prior art document. The Office Action also notes on page 6 that the E-speak system disclosed in the prior art document receives an XML document and transforms the XML document into a "DOM document." It is respectfully submitted that the XML document noted in the prior art document is not transformed into another document or operated upon so as to create a new document, as required by claims 1, 8, 15 and 22. Rather, the format of the XML document is merely changed into a document object model (DOM) format, i.e., the substance of the document is not changed.

Attorney Docket RSW920000077US1
Serial No. 09/754,891

Further, the prior art document does not disclose, teach or suggest that the XML document is transformed into another document according to transformation information provided in a specification or operated upon to create a new document according to an operating action provided in the specification, as required by claims 1, 8, 15 and 22. Accordingly, it is submitted that the prior art document does not anticipate the subject matter recited in independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 and their respective dependent claims.

Amended independent claim 23 recites, in part:

creating at least one e-business service definition document separate from at least one input document containing the data inputs wherein the specified details of the data inputs and the specified details of the interactions are recorded in the at least one e-business service definition document

Amended independent claim 25 recites, in part:

creating at least one application definition document separate from at least one input document containing the data inputs wherein the specified details of the data inputs and the specified details of the interactions are recorded in the at least one application definition document

Support for the newly added recitation “separate from at least one input document containing the data inputs” in claims 23 and 25 can be found in paragraphs 71, 72 and 90 of corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0091533 A1. It is believed that originally filed claims 23 and 25 provide support for the added limitation “in the at least one e-business service [application] definition document.” No new matter is involved.

Nowhere does the prior art document disclose, teach or suggest providing at least one input document containing data inputs separate from at least one e-business service or application definition document. In an example set out in Appendix A of the prior art document, a “lookup.xml” document is provided by a client to a service provider. The “lookup.xml” document contains input data. However, no e-business service or application definition document recording details of data inputs and interactions is provided separate from the lookup.xml document or any other input document. It is advantageous to provide at least one input document containing data inputs separate from at least one e-business service or

Attorney Docket RSW920000077US1
Serial No. 09/754,891

application definition document because it allows the details of the interactions to be varied without affecting the form of the data inputs. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 23-26 define patentably over the applied prior art.

Amended independent claim 27 recites, in part:

providing at least one application definition document encoded in a structured markup language, wherein the application definition documents specify the interactions and at least one data input to be used in the interactions, and wherein details of the specified interactions and data inputs are specified in the structured markup language; and
processing the application definition documents to carry out the data and process interactions in response to receiving at least one separate input document containing the at least one data input.

Support for the newly added limitations set out in claim 27 can be found in paragraphs 71, 72 and 90 of corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0091533 A1. No new matter is involved.

As noted above, in the example set out in Appendix A of the prior art document, a "lookup.xml" document is provided by a client to a service provider. However, nowhere does the prior art document disclose, teach or suggest processing an application definition document to carry out data and process interactions in response to receiving at least one separate input document containing at least one data input. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 27, 28 and 30 define patentably over the applied prior art.

Further with this paper, claims 5, 12 and 19 have been amended so as to no longer comprise multiple dependent claims. The term "means" has been changed to "configured" in claims 1, 2, 6, and 7. In claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 28 the recitation "and/or" has been changed to "or." In claims 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27 and 28 the language "steps of" or "step of" has been deleted. The language "one or more" has been changed to "at least one" in claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27 and 28. Claim 29 has been deleted. No new matter is involved.

Attorney Docket RSW920000077US1
Serial No. 09/754,891

In view of the above remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-28 and 30 define patentably over the prior art. Early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Stevens & Showalter, L.L.P.

By


Robert L. Showalter
Registration No. 33,579

7019 Corporate Way
Dayton, OH 45459-4238
Telephone: 937-438-6848
Fax: 937-438-2124
Email: rshowalter@sspatlaw.com